

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ASIAN-PARLIAMENTARY DEBATE IN TEACHING SPEAKING AT SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Rio Sanjaya, Ari Nurweni, Hartati Hasan

Riosanjaya74@gmail.com

Abstract

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menguji apakah tehnik ini dapat meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara siswa, dan untuk mengidentifikasi permasalahan yang dihadapi siswa selama proses pembelajaran. Penelitian ini melibatkan 30 siswa kelas XI IPA II SMAN 5 Bandar Lampung tahun ajaran 2013/2014 dan menggunakan desain penelitian *one group pretest-posttest* serta menggunakan observasi, kuesioner, dan rekaman video dan audio. Hasil penelitian menunjukan bahwa ada peningkatan yang signifikan dari kemampuan berbicara siswa setelah mempelajari tehnik debat Parlementer Asia. Nilai rata-rata siswa pada pretest sebesar 46.33, nilai rata-rata pada posttest sebesar 60.53, dan t-ratio lebih tinggi dari t-table ($10.249 > 2.045$). Siswa menemukan berbagai kendala pada proses pembelajaran. Dapat disimpulkan bahwa proses penerapan berjalan sukses dengan indikator peningkatan kemampuan berbicara siswa.

The objectives of the research were to examine whether or not the Asian Parliamentary Debate technique can increase the students' speaking ability, and to identify the students' problems during the learning process. This research involved 30 students of XI IPA II Class of SMAN 5 Bandar Lampung academic year 2013/2014 and employed the *one group pretest-posttest design*. This research used the observation sheet, questionnaire, and video and audio recording to collect the data. The result showed that there was a significant increase of the the students' speaking ability after being taught by using this technique. The students' mean score in the pretest was 46.33, the mean score in the posttest was 60.53, and t-ratio is higher than t-table ($10.249 > 2.045$). The students found many obstacles during the teaching and learning process. Overall, it can be concluded the process of the implementation ran successfully with the indicator of the students' improvement in speaking.

Keywords: *asian parliamentary debate technique, hortatory exposition text, speaking ability*

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, speaking has become increasingly important to be mastered by senior high school students. They are expected to be able to speak English in order to achieve the goals of the curriculum implemented by the government. They also need to master speaking in order to be able to use it for the communicative purposes. According to Burns and Joyce (1997), speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving as well as processing information. Its form and meaning are dependent on the context in which they occurs, including the participants themselves, their collective experiences, the physical environment, and the purposes for speaking. Speaking requires the learners not only know how to produce specific points of language such as grammar, pronunciation, or vocabulary (*linguistic competence*), but also that they understand when, why, and in what ways to produce language (*sociolinguistic competence*).

In order to achieve the goals of the curriculum in English teaching and learning process, integrating students' knowledge and attitude in speaking should be taken into account considering the needs of senior high school students itself in the future. It means that students of senior high school are required to have sufficient competencies in oral communication that covers negotiation ability, critical thinking, public speaking ability, and so forth. Therefore, in order to achieve those goals and accommodate students' needs in the future, one of techniques that can be implemented by teachers in English classroom particularly in speaking class is debate.

Nisbett (2003) declares that debate is an important educational tool for learning analytic thinking ability and for forcing self-conscious reflection on the validity of one's ideas. In addition, the researcher also has conducted a pre-observation in one of senior high schools in Bandar Lampung that was SMAN 5 Bandar Lampung. He found that the implementation of the debate technique in that school was very potential to develop students' speaking. If we correlate the debate technique with several theories of speaking English, it can be clearly seen that the debate technique is in line with the objectives of teaching speaking and the principles of speaking.

Harris (1974) defines speaking as the encoding process whereby we communicate our ideas, thought, and feeling orally. It means that we produce spoken message to someone. The spoken message includes ideas, thought and feeling that we want to share, influence, or interact to other people. This theory is supported by Lado. Lado (1961) describes speaking as the ability to express oneself in life situation, or the ability to report acts or situations in precise words, or the ability to converse, or to express a sequence of idea fluently. These ideas mean that speaking emphasizes more the ability of an individual to convey something whether it is in the form of expression, report with the language he has. Those theories in line with Biber (1999) who states that spoken language takes place in real time, and are subject to the limitations of working memory so that its principles of linear construction are adapted to that purpose. A researcher can retract a sentence and it can be as if it never existed for the reader.

From the concepts of speaking stated above, it can be summarized that speaking is a complex oral activity that is done by two or more people in order to express or deliver one's ideas, respond other's idea, and share information involving our cognitive and affective. Therefore, based on some theories, and several previous findings, the researcher implemented the Asian Parliamentary Debate technique in teaching speaking at the second grade students of SMA Negeri 5 Bandar Lampung in order to examine the process of the implementation of the Asian Parliamentary Debate technique, to find out the increase of the students' speaking ability after being taught by using the Asian Parliamentary Debate technique, and identify the students' problems during the implementation of the Asian Parliamentary Debate technique.

RESEARCH METHODS

As the researcher has stated in the previous chapter, this research focused on the implementation of debate. In order to answer the problems, the researcher applied the pre-experimental design in the research. *The one group pretest-posttest design* was applied and the speaking test was administered to the students in order to know how good their speaking ability was. Then, the researcher randomly chose one class of second grade by using lottery and the subjects of this research were the students of XI A II class, SMAN 5 Bandar Lampung academic year 2013/2014. In the teaching process, the treatment given to the students was learning speaking through debate. The model of the debate implemented by the researcher was the Asian Parliamentary Debate. The researcher conducted a pretest (T1) in a form of a speaking test, three times treatments (X), and the posttest (T2).

The research was conducted in five meetings, one meeting for the pretest, three meetings for the treatment, and one meeting for the posttest. The sources of the data were the teacher, students as well as the students' performances in the debate. Then, the researcher was observing the students when they performed the debate in front of the class. In conducting the research, the researcher applied three instruments that were the speaking test, observation sheets, and questionnaire. In order to get an effective and a comprehensive inputs towards the implementation of the Asian Parliamentary Debate technique, the researcher has examined the process in the implementation of the Asian Parliamentary Debate. The researcher analyzed this aspect by conducting some observations. The researcher applied observation sheets adapted from APKG (*Alat Penilaian Kemampuan Guru*) in order to establish the same and valid perception towards the effectiveness of the teaching and learning process as well as the activities done by students in the teaching and learning process. There were two formats of observation during three time treatments. The first format was the researcher observed the students by using the students' activities observation sheets. The second format was the teacher evaluated the researcher by using the teaching effectiveness observation sheets.

In addition, the researcher not only took observation sheets and made a live evaluation towards students' performance and attitude in the class but also recorded students' performance during the implementation of the Asian Parliamentary debate in the class. The video recording was needed to support the observer examining the run of the teaching and learning process in the class. The video recording was also

used to evaluate students' speaking ability and achievement during the treatments. From the treatments that were conducted by the observer, it can be reported that the students of XI A II SMAN 5 Bandar Lampung overall were able to perform the Asian Parliamentary Debate in a form of hortatory exposition text in the class.

The researcher used the test of speaking to measure the students ability in speaking before being taught by the Asian Parliamentary debate technique, observation sheets to observed the activities done by the students and the researcher during the teaching and learning and process in the classroom, and questionnaire in the research to gather the information from the students about their problems in learning the technique.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

a. Results

During the process of teaching and learning in the class, there were more obstacles faced by the researcher in conducting the research. The teaching method with debate technique that was implemented in the process of teaching and learning had to be a "student-centered". In order to establish a good process of teaching and learning in the class, it needed more contribution and participation from the students. However, during the teaching and learning process in the class most students were so reluctant to deliver or respond arguments. It shows that they felt afraid and not confident to speak English in the class because they were not accustomed to do so. The students usually learned English by using textbook, practicing the English by answering question from the book in a written form. They did not have enough time to practice

their speaking ability. Moreover, the students of XI A II mostly interacted with their friends and the teacher in their class by using their (L1) first language. The portion of the use of the L2 (second language) was not high and it only played a role as a complementary. Overall, the students were very passive in this first treatment.

At the second treatment, the observer noted that “After conducting the first treatment and giving feedback to students, the researcher found some students made a progress and an improvement. The participation of students in the class increased. The students tended to be braver to express their ideas and thought even if they spoke a little and made some grammatical errors. Overall, students’ fluency, vocabulary, and verbal comprehensiveness were getting better.” It shows that there were a progress and improvement in the second treatment. Even if there were a progress and an improvement of students’ performance, the students still committed mistakes especially grammatical mistakes.

At the third treatment, the observer noted that “the atmosphere of the class in the third treatment was more enthusiastic. There were many interactions between the students and students as well as the students and the teacher. The students were enthusiastic to respond a topic given by the researcher. The students had a better performance in the third meeting than in the previous meetings”. It shows that, the order of the debate was also getting better and the students were more confident so that they spoke English more systematic and fluent. On top of that, the topic that discussed by the students was more complex meaning that the students’ vocabulary achievement improved.

During the teaching and learning process, the students sometimes were not confident to speak in English which actually they could speak English. The students accustomed to learning English by using their first language in the class. They mostly learned English by using textbook and practiced English in the written forms. These conditions hampered the process of the implementation at the first time but the researcher could overcome it by utilizing the school facilities such as LCD projector for explaining the materials and video recorder for recording the activities in the class. The students could easily understand the material by using LCD, and they also could explore and record their speaking ability without feeling afraid of making mistakes in front of the researcher. The students had a larger space to explore their speaking ability and the researcher could monitor the students and evaluate the students' performance. Therefore, overall the process of the Implementation of the Asian Parliamentary Debate technique ran successfully with the indicator of students' improvement in speaking English.

In the pretest, the mean score of fluency is 9.60, grammar is 8.80, vocabulary is 10.13, pronunciation is 8.73, and comprehension is 9.07. The highest mean score in the pretest is vocabulary (10.13) and the lowest mean score is pronunciation (8.73). Even if the mean scores of aspects of speaking are vary, the difference of each score of every aspect of speaking is not significant and the gap is not wide. The range of the mean scores of the aspects of speaking is still between 8 and 11. Meanwhile, the possible maximum scores of each aspect is 20. The mean of students' speaking score in pretest is 46.33.

The posttest was administered to measure the students' speaking ability after being given three time treatments. The posttest was conducted on May 28th, 2014. The researcher also focused on five aspects of speaking in testing them. There are pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. In the posttest, There are Fluency (13.00), grammar (10.86), vocabulary (12.67), pronunciation (10.73), and comprehension (13.27). While, the possible score for each aspect is 20. The mean for posttest is 60.53.

Based on the difference between pretest and posttest, it implies that the Asian Parliamentary debate has an influence towards students speaking achievement. It can be seen from the total score of pretest 1390 up to 1816. The mean is from 46.33 up to 60.53. Basically in his research, the researcher intended to find out the improvement of each aspect of speaking.

Table 1 the Increase of Pretest and Posttest in Each Aspect

No.	Aspect	Pretest	Posttest	Increase
1	Fluency	9.60	13.00	3.4
2	Grammar	8.80	10.86	2.06
3	Vocabulary	10.13	12.67	2.54
4	Pronunciation	8.73	10.73	2
5	Comprehension	9.07	13.27	4.2
	Total	46.33	60.53	14.2
	Average	10.66	14.31	3.65

It can be seen in the table 1, the increase of each aspect of speaking. Comprehension improved the most with the increase (4.2) followed by fluency (3.4), vocabulary (2.54), grammar (2.06), and pronunciation (2.00). Based on the table 1, it can be seen that the increase of each aspect of speaking is vary. It can be reported that the aspect of speaking which had the highest increase was comprehension. It was followed by fluency, vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation respectively. It is very interesting seeing that the aspect of speaking that increased the most was comprehension.

In order to find out whether the hypothesis testing in chapter 2 is accepted or not, the researcher analyzed the result of hypothesis test by using t-test which could find out the significance of the treatment. The hypothesis was analyzed at significant level of 0.05 in which the hypothesis is approved if $\text{sign} < \alpha$. From the result of paired sample test in T-test computation, it can be reported that t-ratio was higher than t-table ($10.249 > 2.045$) and with the level of significant ($p < 0.05$) and two tails is $p = 0.000$ ($p < 0.05$). From the result of the hypothesis testing, it can be concluded that there was a significant increase of the students' speaking ability after being taught by using the Asian Parliamentary Debate. Therefore, the result of the hypothesis testing showed that H1 is accepted.

In order to find out the problem faced by students in the implementation of Asian Parliamentary Debate, the researcher distributed the questionnaire that consisted of 4 questions. There are four main aspects of the questions discussed in this section. The first is the problem in the role of speakers. The second is the students' problem in the

case building or brainstorming session. The third is the problem in understanding the components of debate, and the last is students' speaking improvement after performing debate. After learning the Asian Parliamentary Debate technique, some students considered that learning debate is quite difficult. The students perceive that they do not have a good ability in speaking English. They found many obstacles during the teaching and learning process. From the aspect of role of speaker, some students found difficulties in comprehending the role of each speaker. During the brainstorming session, most students share their ideas by using their first language in order to make their partner easier to understand the topic. The problems were also faced by students during the debate session. Some of the students were still getting confused to arrange and deliver arguments systematically. Even though, overall the students perceived that their ability in speaking English improved gradually.

b. Discussion and Finding

During the process of teaching and learning of Asian Parliamentary Debate, the researcher found that the students were actually passive at the beginning of the lesson. After several treatments, they gradually became more active in the teaching and learning process through Asian Parliamentary Debate. It can be seen from the result that the students tended to be communicative, following the learning well, being creative, being cooperative and so forth. In aspect of bravery to deliver the argument and also ask the question to the teacher, the students were still reluctant to do so and after several meeting they finally could do that. The students tended to keep

silent in the classroom. They were so shy and afraid of delivering their arguments, and even asking some questions to the teacher. But it was different at the third treatment. They had actively delivered their argument. They were gradually being confident to ask some question to the teacher. It shows that finally there is a classroom interaction between teacher and also students during the three times treatment. The technique requires students to interact in the class. The students gradually deliver their arguments well. The debate technique requires students' and teacher's participation in the class. It is line with the finding found by Hamzah. Hamzah (2013) in the analysis of classroom interaction, found that teacher's elicitation reflected as the second highest percentage from all the teaching exchange patterns with the percentage 21.74%. This phenomenon occurred because the teaching learning process was both student-centered type and teacher-centered type.

The researcher realized that the students were not accustomed to speaking English. They also confessed that they seldom spoke English in the class. Moreover, when learning English, the students mostly spoke in Bahasa Indonesia and practiced English by using written exercise such as answering questions by in the textbook, and so forth. Thus, by implementing the technique, the researcher had encouraged students to be accustomed to speaking up and deliver their arguments. The students' improvement in speaking increased gradually during the process of the implementation of the debate. The identical finding also found by a Japanese researcher. Fukuda (2003) found that before the debates only 30.8% of the students were not afraid of expressing their opinions when they were not the same as others'.

After the debate this figure rose to 56.7%. He goes on to say that the knowledge or ability which came from the practice in the debates led the students become more accustomed to expressing opinions.

In teaching speaking of hortatory exposition text, Asian Parliamentary Debate can increase the students' speaking ability. It might be caused by the real-life situation of the class which can make the students interested in following the lesson. The students could express their thought and ideas. They also could sharpen their ability in speaking English by practicing debate. It is in line with Davidson's theory (1996). He states that with practice, many students show obvious progress in their ability to express and defend ideas in debate and they often quickly recognize the flaws in each other's arguments. The learners will easily be involved in the real-life situation when practicing debate. They can use their gesture as the expression when they are deliver arguments. Therefore, it is recommended to use Asian Parliamentary Debate in teaching speaking of hortatory exposition text.

CONCLUSIONS

a. Conclusions

Having conducted the research at the first grade of SMAN 5 Bandar Lampung and analyzing the data, the reseacher would like to give the conclusion as follows:

1. The process of the teaching and learning through the Asian Parliamentary Debate technique in SMAN 5 Bandar Lampung ran well. Even if at the first time the students sometimes were not confident to speak in English which actually they

could speak English, the students accustomed to learning English by using their first language in the class, they mostly learned English by using textbook and practiced English in the written forms and these conditions hampered the process of the implementation, the researcher finally could overcome it by utilizing the school facilities such as LCD projector for explaining the materials and video recorder for recording the activities in the class. The students could easily understand the material by using LCD, and they also could explore and record their speaking ability without feeling afraid of making mistakes in front of the researcher.

2. Based on the result and also discussion explained before, there is a significant increase of the the students' speaking ability after being taught by using the Asian Parliamentary Debate technique. The result of posttest is higher than the result of pretest. There is an increase from the average score of pretest (46.33) to posttest (60.53). Then, the result of hypothesis test shows also that the hypothesis is accepted because T-ratio was higher than t-table ($10.249 > 2.045$) with the level of significance 0.05.
3. Some students considered that learning debate is quite difficult. They found many obstacles during the teaching and learning process. From the aspect of role of speaker, some students found difficulties in comprehending the role of each speaker. They still shared their ideas by using their first language and got confused to arrange and deliver arguments systematically. Eventhough, overall the students perceived that their ability in speaking English improved gradually.

b. Suggestions

Some suggestions that the researcher would like to propose based on the conclusion are as follows:

1. The English teachers are suggested to use the Asian Parliamentary Debate technique in the teaching of speaking in order to improve students' speaking ability. This new technique can be used by the teachers who want to explore students speaking ability and stimulate students' critical thinking. This technique is a complete package which covers the combination of speaking, discussion, character building, and critical thinking.
2. English teachers who want to use Asian Parliamentary Debate technique are suggested to be able to make some variations in teaching so that the students do not feel that speaking by using the debate is difficult to learn. Besides that, the teachers should pay attention toward the problems which might occur in the teaching and learning process as what has been explained in this research. They should always give the students some motivation so that the students are confident to speak English in the classroom, especially in delivering arguments in front of their friends.
3. In teaching speaking through Asian Parliamentary debate, the teacher should make sure that the students are able to deliver arguments by using their own words, not as the result of memorizing the sentences. This will cause the technique that is used will not be effective in improving students' speaking ability.

REFERENCES

- Biber, D. 1999. *Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Burns, A., & Joyce, H. (1997). *Focus on speaking*. Sydney: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research.
- Fukuda, S. 2003. Attitudes toward argumentation in college EFL classes in Japan. *Proceedings of the First Asia TEFL International Conference*. Busan, Korea. pp. 417-418.
- Hamzah, I. 2003. *The Implementation of Debate Technique in Teaching Speaking at the Second Grade of SMA YP Unila Bandar Lampung*. Bandar Lampung: Lampung University.
- Harris, D. P. 1974. *Testing English as a Second Language*. New Delhi: Tata Mc Graw-Hill Publishing.
- Lado, R. 1961. *Language Teaching a Scientific Approach*. New Delhi: Grow Hill Publishing Company.
- Nisbett, R. E. (2003) *The geography of thought*. New york: The Free Press.